

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 25, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-17, and 41-44 remain in this application. Claims 1-10 and 18-40 have been withdrawn as a result of an earlier restriction requirement. Claims 41-44 are new claims added by this amendment.

Specification

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggested that the form of the abstract should be changed. The abstract is amended herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 103

In the Office Action, claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al (US 4,846,724) in view of Gabower et al (US 6,624,432), and further in view of Wilson (US 5,966,803). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 11

Claim 11 distinguishes over Sasaki, Gabower and Wilson taken singly or in combination at least by reciting "a metallized thermoform connector coupled to an end portion of the cable body and electrically coupled to the vacuum metallized layer." In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "23 is a connector connected to 21 and 39 via 31 and 32 and can be coupled to a grounded housing." This is respectfully traversed because Sasaki teaches away from having a connector coupled to an end portion of the cable body and electrically coupled to the vacuum metallized layer because his conductive shield 23 is electrically insulated from the electrical contact 21. Specifically, Sasaki teaches in column 3 lines 1-2 that "the conductive shield 23 is electrically insulated from the electrical contacts 21," which shows that 23 is *not* a connector connected to 21 and 39 via 31 and 32 as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore,

Sasaki teaches away from the claimed invention and therefore claim 11 is not obvious under Sasaki in view of Gabower and further in view of Wilson.

Claim 13

Claim 13 distinguishes over the cited references taken singly or in combination at least by reciting "insulating top layer extends to a point short of the connector such that the connector is electrically coupled to the metallized layer." The Office action seems to suggest that Sasaki teaches that the insulating top coat 41 extends to a point short of 23. However, a closer look at Sasaki's FIG. 2 clearly shows that the insulating top coat 41 extends past the edge of the connector 23 and even slightly overlaps the connector 23 instead of extending to a point short of the connector as claimed. Therefore, the Applicants believe that at least for this reason claim 12 distinguishes over the cited references in combination or individually.

Claim 14

It appears that claim 14 was rejected because the Examiner combined Sasaki with Wilson and argued that "Wilson discloses vacuum metalizing circuit (col. 2, lines 56-57) with thickness between approx. one-half to twelve microns (col. 3, lines 27-28)." Again the Applicants vigorously traverse. The Applicants do not believe that there is any suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki with Wilson to make the claimed invention, as suggested by the Examiner. In the office action, the Examiner acknowledged that Sasaki does not teach "vacuum metalizing the shielding layer with thickness between approx. one-half to twelve microns and providing a metallized thermoform connector. The Examiner then argued:

Gabower discloses a metallized thermoform connector (Abstract, lines 2-3).

Wilson discloses vacuum metalizing circuit (col. 2, lines 56-57) with thickness between approx. one-half to twelve microns (col. 3 lines 27-28).

In order to determine if there is legally sufficient motivation or suggestion for combining references it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before

him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification. Sasaki teaches a shielded cable that uses a shield layer made of a thick layer (not a thin film). Wilson teaches ball grid array having no through holes or via interconnections and uses in col. 3 lines 27-28 an electrically conductive single layer that is preferably less than 0.5 mils. The Examiner has not given any reason or suggestion why someone would modify Sasaki using the teachings of Wilson to make the claimed invention other than the limitations found within those references can be mixed and matched to show all of the limitations of the claimed invention. The Applicants believe that there is no legal basis for a suggestion or motivation to combine Sasaki and Wilson. Therefore the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his obviousness rejection of claim 14 based on Sasaki in view of Gabower and Wilson.

Claim15

Claim 15 distinguishes over the cited references taken singly or in combination at least by reciting that the "metallized thermoform is coupled to an outside surface of a nonconductive connector." The Office action seems to suggest that Sasaki teaches that 23 is coupled to 41 (an outside surface of a nonconductive connector). However, a closer look at Sasaki shows that this is not the case. In column 3 lines 59-60 Sasaki describes 41 as an insulator housing and not a nonconductive connector. Moreover, the Examiner himself has described 41 as an insulating **top coating** and not as a nonconductive **connector**. Additionally, assuming arguendo that Sasaki's 41 is a nonconductive connector and that the conductive shield is coupled to 41 as asserted by the Examiner, Sasaki's **Fig. 2 clearly shows that 23 is coupled to an inner surface of 41 and not an outer surface of 41 as asserted by the Examiner and as claimed**. Therefore, the cited prior art does not teach all of the claimed limitations. For these reasons alone the Applicants believe that claim 15 is not obvious and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his rejection.

Claim16

Claim 16 distinguishes over the cited references taken singly or in combination at least by reciting that "the connector further comprises spaced protrusions, wherein the connector is electrically coupled to the metallized layer with the spaced protrusions." The Office action

seems to suggest that Sasaki teaches "31 and 32 are spaced protrusions." However a close review of Sasaki does not show or suggest that 31 and 32 are spaced protrusions. For example, in column 3 lines 17-19, Sasaki describes 31 and 32 as a first and second conductive portion but fails to describe them as protrusions or anything that resembles a protrusion. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not shown all of the limitations of claim 16 because he has not shown how Sasaki can be interpreted to teach that 31 and 32 are protrusions.

Claims 12 - 16

In addition to the arguments presented above, since claim 12-16 depend from independent claim 11 and independent claim 11 is not obvious for the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claims 12-16 are also not obvious.

Therefore, claims 11-16 are not believed obvious because all of the claimed limitations of claims 11-16 are still not disclosed. Additionally, there is no motivation or suggestion for combining the cited references as suggested in the Office Action. The Applicants believe all of the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants have amended claim 17 in accordance with the Examiner's comments and therefore claim 17 should now be allowable. Additionally, new claims 41-44 depend from independent claim 17 and should also be allowable.

Examiners Request for Listing of Reference Numerals in Table Form

In the conclusion of the Office Action, a request for a listing of reference numerals in table form was made. The Applicants provide the following table in response to this request.

Appl. No. 10/691,391
Amdt. dated November 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2005

PATENT

shielded cable	FIGs. 1-3
a cable body	20
electrical conductors	22
insulating substrate;	24
a vacuum metallized shielding layer	26
a metallized thermoform connector	33
grounded housing	38
spaced protrusions	46

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Jesus Del Castillo
Reg. No. 51,604

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
JDC:gjs
60580150 v1